

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
SHERMAN DIVISION**

**SCOTT SCHER,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**DEUTSCHE BANK TRUST COMPANY  
AMERICAS, ET AL.,**

**Defendants.**

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:21-cv-48**

---

**NOTICE OF PLAINTIFF’S FAILURE TO RESPOND TO  
DEFENDANTS’ MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

---

Deutsche Bank Trust Company Americas, as Trustee for Residential Accredit Loans, Inc., Mortgage Asset-Backed Pass-Through Certificates Series 2006-QS14 and PHH Mortgage Corporation (together, “Defendants”), file this *Notice of Plaintiff’s Failure to Respond to Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment*, and respectfully show the Court as follows:

1. Defendants filed their *Motion for Summary Judgment and Brief in Support Thereof* on Friday, October 1, 2021. (Doc. 14). Defendants then filed their *Unopposed Motion for Leave to File First Amended Motion for Summary Judgment and Brief in Support Thereof* (Doc. 15) on Monday, October 4, 2021. The amendment was sought in order to fix some of the citations to the summary judgment evidence. No other changes were to be made to the original submission. Counsel for Defendants conferred with counsel for Plaintiff Scott Scher (“Plaintiff”), and they were unopposed to the motion for leave to file the amended dispositive motion. That motion for leave was filed incorrectly, with the amended dispositive motion improperly attached as an exhibit. This mistake was corrected the following day on October 5,

2021. (*See* Docs. 16 and 17.) Leave was then granted by this Court on October 7, 2021 (*see* Doc. 18), and the Court deemed *Defendants’ First Amended Motion for Summary Judgment and Brief in Support Thereof* (Doc. 17) (the “Amended Summary Judgment Motion”) filed as of October 7, 2021. (*See* Doc. 18.)

2. Plaintiff was served with each of the above-noted filings via the Court’s electronic service. (*See* Docs. 14-18.) Pursuant to the local rules of this Court, Plaintiff’s deadline to respond to the Amended Summary Judgment Motion was 21 days from the date it was deemed filed (October 7th). (*See* Local CV-7(e).) Thus, this deadline fell on October 28, 2021. Despite service, and despite passage of the 21 day period—indeed now 40 days have passed—Plaintiff has failed to respond.

3. Pursuant to local rule CV-7(d), a party’s failure to timely oppose a motion “creates a presumption that the party does not controvert the facts set out by movant and has no evidence to offer in opposition to the motion.” Plaintiff’s lack of response here permits the Court to presume Plaintiff has no controverting evidence to raise a fact issue in support of his claims. Defendants respectfully submit that the Court should, therefore, summarily dismiss all of Plaintiff’s claims with prejudice for all the reasons Defendants discuss in their Amended Summary Judgment Motion.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Elizabeth K. Duffy

**Robert T. Mowrey**

Texas Bar No. 14607500  
rmowrey@lockelord.com

**Arthur E. Anthony**

Texas Bar No. 24001661  
aanthony@lockelord.com

**Elizabeth K. Duffy**

Texas Bar No. 24050535  
eduffy@lockelord.com

LOCKE LORD LLP

2200 Ross Avenue, Suite 2800

Dallas, Texas 75201-6776

(214) 740-8000 (Telephone)

(214) 740-8800 (Facsimile)

**ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANTS**

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served on this 16th day of November 2021 via e-filing on:

**Thomas C. Barron**

Law Offices of Thomas C. Barron

P.O. Box 141323

Dallas, Texas 75214

tbarron@barronlawfirm.com

*Attorney for Plaintiff*

/s/ Elizabeth K. Duffy

*Attorney for Defendants*